

Application 09/369,490

Atty Docket: PUMA 1024-1 SF/0027.01 11/14

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 have previously been cancelled, leaving claims 51-76 pending in this application. Claims 51, 54-60, 62, and 64-76 are currently amended. Claims 77-88 are new.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time and thoughtfulness in the interview conducted on January 14, 2003. During the interview, the Hoffman reference was discussed, particularly with reference to claim 51. The Examiner pointed out the architecture on which he relied. The applicant questioned whether Hoffman includes any special key tags that are not defined in HTML, but are recognized by the parent process. The Examiner encouraged applicant to amend the claims, but had no particular suggestions as to what would make the independent claims allowable. No agreement was reached. The Examiner indicated that he would provide an interview summary.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Examiner rejected all the pending claims under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Hoffman, Jr. et al., US Patent No. 6,122,657. This rejection under Hoffman at least needs to be based on Section 103, instead of Section 102, because Hoffman lacks elements of the independent claims. During our interview, the Examiner stressed the architecture that Hoffman describes. This is not enough, because there is not any place in Hoffman that includes a third category of special key tags that can be analogized to a secret code. Hoffman's architecture is adapted to stateless text filtering, as might be performed by a word processor. In Hoffman's architecture, tags that are processed are first recognized as valid HTML tags that should be modified, and then the corresponding text string is modified and passed to a web browser. Modifications include a range of stateless text filtering. (col. 26 line 58 to line 67). Tags that are not processed are ignored and passed through unmodified. Hoffman does not have a third category of "special key tags that include auxiliary information, the special key tags not defined in HTML but recognized by the parent process", as claimed. Hoffman lacks any indication of processing tags that are not valid HTML tags. None of

Application 09/369,490

Atty Docket: PUMA 1024-1 SF/0027.01 12/14

the passages cited by the Examiner makes any reference to processing tags that are not recognized as valid HTML tags. Therefore, a rejection under Section 102 cannot be supported by Hoffman.

Even without amendment of independent claim 51, dependent claims 57-63 should be allowable, because Hoffman's stateless text filtering does not extend to the features in the dependent claims. In response to the claimed features, the Examiner cites [A] col. 3 line 14 to line 23, [B] col. 4 line 47 to col. 5 line 1, and [C] col. 8 line 21 to line 23, at the bottom of page 4 of the Office Action. Passage [A] describes a filtering architecture, but no particular result of stateless text filtering. Passage [B] describes the environment in which stateless text filtering is performed, but does not give any application of Hoffman's invention. Passage [C] finally describes operation of Hoffman's stateless text filtering:

"Any such command is, however, trapped by the Filter module 225. The 'real' request is at this point processed by the Filter core logic (Filter method) 313. At this point, the system can modify the command, delete the command, synthesize new commands, or pass through unchanged the existing command."

None of these passages [A]-[C] and particularly not the substantive passage [C], meet the features claimed in dependent claims 57-63.

Hoffman does not include, as claimed in dependent claim 57, processing the special key tags in the parent process, including triggering of "presenting a set-up dialogue for the parent process". Hoffman's stateless text filtering, in the Examiner's analysis, is the parent process. The passages cited by the Examiner do not include "presenting a set-up dialogue for" Hoffman's filtering engine. Therefore, claim 57 should be allowable.

Hoffman does not include, as claimed in dependent claim 58, processing the special key tags in the parent process, including triggering of "customizing operation of the parent process". The passages cited by the Examiner do not include "customizing" Hoffman's filtering engine. Therefore, claim 58 should be allowable.

Hoffman does not include, as claimed in dependent claim 59, processing the special key tags in the parent process, including triggering of "presenting a sign-on

Application 09/369,490**Atty Docket: PUMA 1024-1 SF/0027.01** 13/14

dialogue not found in the web page". The passages cited by the Examiner do not include having Hoffman's filtering engine present "a sign-on dialogue not found in the web page". Therefore, claim 59 should be allowable.

Hoffman does not include, as claimed in dependent claim 60, processing the special key tags in the parent process, including triggering of "modifying a system registry entry corresponding to the parent process". The passages cited by the Examiner do not include "modifying a system registry entry corresponding to" Hoffman's filtering engine. Therefore, claim 60 and 61, which depend from 60, should be allowable.

Hoffman does not include, as claimed in dependent claim 62, processing the special key tags in the parent process, including triggering of "publishing a user-specific web page". The passages cited by the Examiner do not include having Hoffman's filtering engine customize the dialogue with the web server by "publishing a user-specific web page". Therefore, claim 62 and 63, which depends from 62, should be allowable.

The device claims that correspond to claims 57-63 are claims 70-76. Dependent claims 70-76 should be allowable, even without amendment of claim 64, for the same reasons as described above.

Applicant has amended the independent claims 51 and 64 to emphasize the stateful manipulation of database entries, including storing, modifying and using persistent database entries. In newly added dependent claims 77 and 83, the text filtering process of "modifying the special key tags in the parent process, and passing the modified special key tags to the embedded web browser" is claimed as an additional step, distinct from database manipulation. This should make it clear that Hoffman's stateless text filtering is different than the claimed database manipulation. Therefore, independent claims 51 and 64 should be allowable as amended.

Applicant does not intend to introduce any new matter by the amendment of claims 51 and 64. Updating the system registry with data from a special key tag is described on page 7 of the application. Populating a registry and subsequently retrieving the persisted information that is a centralized database is described on pages 22-24, 27-28 and 31-32. Several of the original claims, including 6-8, referred to the

Application 09/369,490

Atty Docket: PUMA 1024-1 SF/0027.01

14/14

system registry. Accordingly, the amendments should not be viewed as adding any new matter.

After the amendment of the independent claims, both the independent claims and the claims that depend from them should be allowable. The dependent claims should be allowable both because the independent claims are allowable and for the additional reasons described above.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The undersigned normally can be reached between 8:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., excepting lunch, at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 16 January 2004


Ernest J. Beffel, Jr.
Reg. No. 43,489

CUSTOMER NO. 22470

Haynes Beffel & Wolfeld LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax